

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference P39183-P0	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/JP2005/011362	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 21 June 2005 (21.06.2005)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 02 July 2004 (02.07.2004)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.		

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 5 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

Date of issuance of this report
16 January 2007 (16.01.2007)

Authorized officer

Masashi Honda

The International Bureau of WIPO
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

e-mail: pt08@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference P39183-P0		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/JP2005/011362	International filing date (day/month/year) 21.06.2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 02.07.2004	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC			
Applicant MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/011362

Box No. 1 Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/011362

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-14	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-14	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-14	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP, 2000-311129, A (Hewlett-Packard Company), 7 November, 2000 (07.11.2000), [0008], [0019], [0038] – [0044] & DE, 010006416, A1</p> <p>Document 2: JP, 2000-069077, A (Canon Inc.), 3 March, 2000 (03.03.00), [Abstract], [Figure 4] (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 3: JP, 2003-153348, A (Toshiba Corp.), 23 May, 2003 (23.05.03), [Figure 7] and [Figure 8] (Family: none)</p> <p>The inventions of claims 1-14 are merely additions of the well-known commonly used arts described in documents 2, 3 and others to the invention described in document 1, so that they do not appear to be novel or to involve an inventive step.</p> <p>Document 1 (paragraph [0008]) describes the idea of stating the role or service performed or provided by a computer instead of specifying a specific computer. And [0040] describes the idea of identifying an ME (Managed Entity) having the desired MI (Management Interface) and launching the operation for the identified ME. Further, [0043] describes the idea of performing control on the basis of the usage status as with the toner status.</p> <p>Therefore, the invention described in document 1 provides a constitution that identifies a specific computer by searching, from abstract MEs, an ME having an MI that fulfills the conditions (including both conditions related to specifications and conditions related to the usage status) to perform control, so that, substantially, it provides the same constitution as the inventions of claims 1-14.</p> <p>Note that whereas the inventions in claims 1-14 use tables to search for ones that fulfill the various conditions, the invention described in document 1 does not clearly state that tables are used, but as described in, for example, documents 2 and 3, searches using tables are well-known in this technical field, so that this is a matter that a person skilled in the art could perform as required.</p> <p>And concerning claim 4, changing the conditions as necessary is a matter that a person skilled in the art could perform as required.</p> <p>And concerning claims 6 and 7, document 1 does not clearly state a constitution where the location and time are used for the usage status, but using information on the location, etc. as shown in document 2 to identify equipment is a matter that a person skilled in the art could perform as required.</p> <p>And also concerning claims 9-11, defining multiple conditions, providing priority ranks in</p>			

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/011362

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability: citations and explanations supporting such statement
-----------	---

the multiple conditions and sharing among users are matters that a person skilled in the art could perform as required.